Expiry Date - 23/08/2010

Development Control – Delegated Officer Report

Application Number: ADC/0224/10 **Recommendation – Permit Application**

Site: **114 Old Fort Road Shoreham-by-Sea West Sussex BN43 5HB**

Proposal: **Enlarged rear conservatory**

The Application

The application relates to a detached house located on the southern side of the road with access to the beach from the rear garden, and a 27m long front garden set-back to the two-storey section of the building.

Permission is sought to extend an existing sunroom located on the eastern side of the rear elevation with a rear conservatory. The proposed conservatory would be 4.3m in width, by 3.5m in depth, by 2.9m in height to the top of the pitched roof. The east side elevation would be made up of a solid wall 2.15m in height, set in from the eastern boundary of the site by 1m.

To the east of the dwelling is No.116, another large detached house, with a rear projecting single-storey extension with south facing outlook. The boundary between the two sites is made up of brick wall 2m in height.

Consultations and Representations

Third Parties: There has been one letter of objection from the owner of No.116 Old Fort Road, to the east.

They feel that the conservatory will shade their garden and patio from the sun which is where they sit to enjoy the beach and the sea. They therefore object on the grounds of over-development of the site and blocking of light.

Concern is also raised about the applicant's future intentions for the conservatory, and that it may be used as the base to extend the existing first floor balcony.

Relevant Planning Policies and Guidance

Adopted Adur District Local Plan 1993-2006 (ADC 1996) (saved policies): AG1, AH7 and Appendix II 'Supplementary Planning Guidance' comprising: Development Control Standard No.3 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings.'
PPS 1 'Delivering Sustainable Development' (ODPM 2005)

Expiry Date - 23/08/2010

Planning Assessment

Policies
Policy AH7 of the Local Plan states that extensions and alterations should be designed so as not to result in an unacceptable degree of overlooking, a loss of natural light or an overbearing effect on neighbouring dwellings. They should be of sympathetic design and materials to the original dwelling and the area in general.

Development Control Standard No.3 entitled 'Extensions and Alterations to Dwellings' states that the most important basic principle is that any extension should be in keeping with the appearance, scale, design and character of both the existing dwelling and the street scene generally. With regards to rear single-storey extensions it states that extensions that are within 1m of a common side boundary with an attached dwelling should normally be no deeper than 3.5m.

Visual amenity
The proposed conservatory is common in design for dwellings within the built up area, however in this case it is clearly on view from the beach, which is a public area. There are other dwellings in the vicinity (No.104 to the west and No.120 to the east) which have similar styled conservatories and it is not considered that the development would be particularly out of keeping or unsympathetic in its design. The proposals would project from the rear elevation by 3.5m leaving a rear garden length of 6.3m, and whilst this is less that the usual 11m required by the above DC standard, it is not considered that it would be uncharacteristic for the locality.

Residential amenity
The proposed conservatory would be attached to the eastern side of the rear elevation of the dwelling with the solid wall of the conservatory following the flank wall of the building. A gap of 3m would be retained between the side of the proposed conservatory and the westernmost part of the adjacent dwelling (No.116), and it would project 2m past the rear.

It is not considered that there would be any loss of privacy or outlook to the rear of the adjacent property to the east (No.116). The height of the main body of the proposed conservatory would only be marginally taller that the existing boundary wall, and it is therefore considered that it would not result in any excessive overshadowing of the neighbours garden.

The west elevation of the conservatory would be fully glazed, however it would be 9.8m from the western boundary, which is also made up with a 2m high brick wall. It is therefore considered that the proposed conservatory would not have an adverse impact on the privacy, outlook or light to the rear of No.112 to the west.

Expiry Date - 23/08/2010

Other matters
The objector raises concerns about the possibility of the existing first-floor balcony being extended over the proposed conservatory. This form of development would require planning permission, where the effects on the neighbouring dwellings from any such balcony would be fully taken into consideration, and any such application would be judged on its on merits.

Recommendation

APPROVE for reason that :-

1PPi

1. C1Ci
2. C12Eii - amended
   ..... of the external walls and alterations hereby permitted shall...etc.
3. The development hereby permitted shall be carried out in accordance with the following approved plans: 1:500 block plan, elevations, and plans Drawing No. 9307/2 date stamped received 28 June 2008.
   Reason: *For the avoidance of doubt and in the interests of proper planning.*

Case Officer Carlos Hone Date 19.07.10 PB 20/7